

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

Information Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – February 21, 2002

There will be no December ITAC meeting.

**The next regular meeting of the
Information Technology Advisory Committee
Will be scheduled for March 21st**

The February 21st meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Committee, ITAC, was held in the Clerk of the Courts Conference Room, # 2500, in Superior Court for the District of Columbia, at 12:30. Earl Gillespie moderated the meeting.

The following agencies were represented: the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the Office of the Chief Technology Officer, the Youth Services Administration, the Pretrial Services Agency, the Office of the US Attorney, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Office of the Corrections Trustee, the Bureau of Prisons, the Metropolitan Police Department, Court Services and Offender Supervision, the US Probation Office, and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.

* Note: I will be out of town until March 4. As a consequence, I will be unable to forward attachments with this version of the monthly Meeting Notes. I will forward attachments associated with these notes upon my return. If you have questions during my absence, please contact either Carl Mecca (202.727.5920) or Tony Currington (202.533.4664).

1. The first item on the agenda was the updating of the Interagency Agreement on Information Technology. The ITLO had circulated drafts of proposed changes. Each proposed change was presented and discussed. The only two modifications to the proposed language were:
 - The words “ Consistent with each agency’s mission and goals:” were to be inserted between the opening paragraph and the seven tenets of the agreement, and
 - The word “all” was to be removed from the new second tenet, in the sentence “In order for each agency to carry out its own information technology advancement, it must share information with **all** other agencies in a collaborative effort.”

The representative from the Bureau of Prisons, Sonya Thompson agreed to review and edit the agreement. Ms. Thompson will forward the edited agreement to the ITLO, who will forward it to the membership for a seven to ten day review period. If no objections are raised, it will be forwarded to the CJCC for review and approval. If there are objections to the edited format, we will again review the document at our March meeting.

The issue of a “User’s Agreement” was raised by several ITAC members during the ITLO’s one-on-one discussions. It was felt that, as the ITAC member agencies has signed the interagency Agreement and shared data, agencies that were not ITAC members and whose only use of JUSTIS would be to access data should also have an agreement. It was felt this agreement would outline the user’s responsibilities to JUSTIS and the level of service JUSTIS would provide. It was also felt that one agreement with JUSTIS might negate the need for each JUSTIS contributor agency having perhaps 50 or more additional agreements with every user agency.

The ITLO indicate that Bureau of Prisons and CSOSA had many suggestions and appeared to have experience in this matter. He has asked both Sonya Thompson and Davis Stevenson if they would share examples of agreements and/or language for agreements with the ITAC for future discussions.

2. The second agenda item consisted of several discussion points on the subject of access.
 - The JUSTIS Inquiry screen now offers a listing of the data elements, and their definitions, from each agency contribution. To review these listings, click on the agency name on the lower part of the screen where the indexes for each agency are listed.
 - The latest draft of the Agency Access Control Chart was distributed. There are three sets of agencies: ITAC members, the initial list of agencies assumed to be DC law enforcement agencies, and an additional set of agencies suggested after the initial list was distributed.

The membership agreed that an NCIC issued ORI might be the best method in ascertaining if an agency is a legitimate law enforcement agency. The ITLO will attempt to find an ORI for each agency. Those that are found to have an ORI will be invited to attend a JUSTIS presentation where they can decide if they want access to JUSTIS.

An agency that desires access will have to meet all current JUSTIS security arrangements and “pay their way”, furnishing such equipment and communication as specified by JUSTIS.

- The United States Probation Office has joined ITAC, with Ms. Gennine Hagar, Deputy Chief, representing the agency.
 - CSOSA has modified the amount of data that will be shared with other JUSTIS participants. The new list will be found on the agency listing on the Inquiry page. The new CSOSA display will not be available until CSOSA has reviewed the new output for correctness
 - MPD has reviewed the access chart and will soon make both arrest a mug shot data available. The availability is pending full automation of their contribution and correcting a problem with a server.
3. Additional data availability has been discussed briefly at many ITAC meetings. Now that JUSTIS Phase 2 is up and stable, many members felt it appropriate to identify additional data needs and determine availability. Mr. George Diffenbacher has agreed to chair discussions on this subject and guide the ITAC through the methodology required to identify data, determine availability and agency willingness to share, and how to conclude the process. George reminded us that while participation remains voluntary, one might review the data currently being contributed to determine if much of it is in fact public information. That being the case, perhaps additional data might fit within that same framework.

George suggested members might start the process by sending him data elements that might be valuable in meeting your agency's mandates for offender processing. Please send your data needs and suggestions for facilitating this process to George.Diffenbacher@csosa.gov as soon as possible. I would imagine both Gorge and I would be sending out reminders.

4. The ITLO distributed a position description for a JUSTIS Information Technology Security Officer to the membership. The CJCC has budgeted for such a position, however without a Director or staff, processing to fill the position might be postponed. None-the-less, the position description was reviewed and accepted by the ITSOC for ITAC review. The ITLO will incorporate any suggestions ITAC members might forward to him, and will then forward the position description to the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety.
5. Funding for JUSTIS Phase 3 should become available soon. As discussed in earlier meetings, unless additional funding is found, the Notification module will be held for future phases.

At this time, Janice Begin, our PSA member, has volunteered to chair the Data Transfer Module effort.

The Quality Alliance Module has no Chair, and the ITLO is accepting volunteers.

The ITLO will ask the USAO to provide a chair for the Notification Module.

The ITLO has asked to chair the Public Access Module.

6. The next regularly schedule ITAC monthly meeting is March 21, 2002.